

ISSN 0258 - 1744

CHRISTIAN ORIENT

A JOURNAL OF EASTERN CHURCHES FOR CREATIVE THEOLOGICAL THINKING

MARCH 2006

VOL. XXVII NO.1



PROCESSED
DEC 12 2007
GTU LIBRARY

ECCLESIOLOGY

EDITORIAL

THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS

Dr. Thomas Naganoolil

MALABAR DELEGATION OF 1796 TO BAGHDAD;
A PRELUDE TO PANDARI SCHISM

Dr. James Puliurumpil

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN HISTORY AND FAITH: A REFLECTION

Dr. Jose Palakeel

BOOKREVIEWS & NEWS

CHRISTIAN ORIENT

A JOURNAL OF EASTERN CHURCHES FOR CREATIVE THEOLOGICAL THINKING

MARCH 2006 VOL. XXVII NO.1

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor

Dr. Thomas Mannooramparampil M.A. S.T.D.

SECTION EDITORS

Ecclesiology

Dr. James Puliurumpil

Liturgy

Dr. Jose Kochuparambil S.T.D.

Spirituality

Dr. Andrews Mekkattukunnel S.T.D.

Ecumenism

Dr. Geevarghese Chediath S.T.D.

News & Documentation

Dr. Scaria Kanniyakonil

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

INDIA

Rs.80

ABROAD

\$30 or Euro 30 by Air mail

\$15 or Euro 17 by Sea mail

SINGLE COPY

INDIA

Rs.20/-

ABROAD

\$ 10 or the equivalent

Inside This Edition

EDITORIAL	2
THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS	3
<i>Dr. Thomas Naganoolil</i>	
MALABAR DELEGATION OF 1796 TO BAGHDAD; A PRELUDE TO PANDARI SCHISM	12
<i>Dr. James Puliurumpil</i>	
BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN HISTORY AND FAITH: A REFLECTION	18
<i>Dr. Jose Palakeel</i>	
BOOKREVIEWS	34
NEWS	

Manuscripts and Book Reviews are to be sent to:

The Managing Editor

CHRISTIAN ORIENT

P.B.No.1, Kottayam 686 010

Tel: 0481 - 571807, 571809, 578319, 574594, 574596

Fax: 91-481-578525

E-mail: tmanoor@sancharnet.in

Web Page Address: www.oirsi.com

Copyright: Christian Orient Trust, Kottayam 686 010

*"O Valiant One who ascended brilliant from within the tomb;
Let me speak about You, concerning your history filled with wonder.
On Your great feast heaven is glad and earth exults
because in You heaven and earth, that were of enmity, were reconciled"*

Wass Leach of Scruggs



*Warm Easter wishes to all our readers,
well wishers and supporters!*

EDITORIAL

Church is a community of faithful or worshippers; people believing in Jesus. They believe in Jesus, the Lord and God. This belief in Jesus is the fundamental principle or basis of being a Christian. Church, the community of Christians who proclaim Jesus as their Lord, has also a historical basis. History of Christianity or history of the Church is, therefore, another essential element in the life of the Church. History and faith are two essential and important elements of the Church. This edition of *Christian Orient* takes into consideration these two realities as distinct but at the same time related.

While the first article *'The Lordship of Jesus'* deals with faith, the second *'Malabar delegation to Baghdad, a prelude to Pandari schism'* with history, the third one *'Bridging the gap between faith and history'* bridges the other two or links them together. "If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. 10:9). This confession that 'Jesus is Lord' is a basic Christian requirement. This confession is so vital that it marks the distinctiveness of Christian faith. It was the force of the Easter experience that compelled the disciples to make such a confession proclaiming his Lordship and ascertaining his power. Proclamation of Jesus' resurrection formed the pivotal point around which all other beliefs about Jesus gathered. Hence, the essential element of the Easter experience was that of exaltation of Jesus rather than of just resuscitation of the corpse.

The faith of the early Church is

transmitted to the generations in history. The history of Christianity demonstrates the strenuous effort down through the centuries to keep faith in the historical figure of Jesus as the Son of God incarnate. Here is the background of the heresies and councils in the early Church. Pandari schism is the first schism in the Syro-Malabar Church which occurred in the last year of the eighteenth century. The faithful of the Malabar Church, dissatisfied with their foreign European missionaries wanted to get rid of them in any way. The failure of all the efforts compelled them to send a delegation to Baghdad to the patriarch of the Chaldean Church, which ended in the so-called Pandari schism. The timely intervention of Rome helped the faithful to be faithful to the Church.

Heresies and schisms, especially in the early Church are due to the incapacity of man to understand the faith elements and the intolerance to accept these faith elements through the legal authorities. It happened in almost all the centuries in the ancient period and in all the Churches. The idea that a particular, historical, human person who lived in a particular place in a particular time is also God was something that was not entirely digestible for many early Christians. Therefore, the councils had to affirm the real faith in Jesus who is both divine and human. It is the fact that Christian faith has solid foundations in the historical person of Jesus of Nazareth. Faith and history should complement each other. Bridging the gap between them thus becomes indispensable.

Editor

THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS

Dr. Thomas Naganoolil

In Christian tradition the title *Lord* is equally applied both to God, whom the New Testament calls the Father, and to the risen Jesus. The most frequent Pauline designation for the risen Jesus is *kyrios*. Within the authentic letters of the first Christian writer the title surfaces around 230 times. In his first preserved epistle alone, which is also the earliest available Christian document, Paul calls Jesus *Lord* not less than 24 times. In the Pauline writings, the title is applied to Jesus at least in three different ways: as the exalted one who is at the right hand of God, as the one who is invoked by the community in prayer and as the one who is expected to return soon. Interestingly, Paul does it without ever feeling the obligation to demonstrate that Jesus merits the title. Moreover, the title *kyrios* in relation to the risen Jesus appears at times in passages that demonstrably represent pre-Pauline tradition (Rom. 10:9; 1Cor. 12:3; Phil. 2:11). The Pauline way of using the title and the pre-Pauline character at least of some of the instances allude to the antiquity of the Christian practice of assigning *Lordship* to Jesus.

According to Rom. 10:9, the confession that 'Jesus is Lord' is a basic Christian requirement. The confession is so vital that it marks the distinctiveness of Christian faith. Paul puts it as follows: "If you confess with

your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. 10:9). The text seems to highlight at least two complementary points regarding the New Testament use of the title for Jesus. First, it entails that the confession of Jesus' Lordship constitutes the defining character of being Christian. Secondly, the text underscores the necessary connection between the resurrection and the Lordship. Whatever be the precise meaning that the early Christians attached to the confession, it was the force of their Easter experience that compelled them to apply the title to Jesus. And evidences prove that the application yielded serious resonances in their faith, individual lives and cultic and devotional practices.

Easter as the Experience of Exaltation

If anything can be generally said about the earliest Christian witnesses, it is that the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection formed the pivotal point around which all other beliefs about Jesus gathered. As Peter Carnley rightly observes, "the affirmation of belief in Christ's resurrection and in Christ as the raised, exalted Lord of the Christian community, was indisputably the point of origin of the efflorescence of the original Christological assessment of Jesus' function and identity."¹ Therefore, the foundational character of the

¹ P. CARNLEY, *The Structure of Resurrection Belief* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987) 6.

disciples' Easter experience can never be ignored in the discussion on christological development.

As repeatedly acknowledged by biblical scholars, given the nature of the available information, a reconstruction of the original event behind the apostolic proclamation of the resurrection of the crucified Jesus is a highly formidable task. A comprehensive consideration of the subject, however, does not pertain to the present purpose. What is called for is a more careful concentration on the disciples' Easter experience. Had the content of the experience been indubitably clear, it would have been easier, on its basis, to assess the later claims. But, as a matter of fact, such is not the case. Evidence should, therefore, be further decoded to assess whether the experience entailed features that would justify the later claims.

When the content of the early Christian experience of the resurrection is further deciphered on the basis of New Testament evidence, it becomes clear that, already in the post-Easter community, the resurrection was promptly interpreted as exaltation at the right hand of God with the help of Psalm 110:1. The Old Testament text which most frequently appears in direct citation or in indirect references in the New Testament is Psalm 110:1. Allusion to Ps. 110:1 is found in many parts of the New Testament: Matt. 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; and secondarily 16:19; Luke 20:42f.; 22:69; Acts 2:34ff.; Rom. 8:34; 1Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12ff. If it is conceded that all the statements that speak of a *sitting* or a *being*

of the risen Jesus 'at the right hand of God' derive from Ps. 110:1, texts like Acts 2:23; 5:31; 7:55f.; Heb. 12:2; and 1Pet. 3:22 may be added to the foregoing list. Yet another variation of the motif may be traced in Rev. 3:21, where the phrase 'at the right hand' is replaced with the notion of the sharing of throne by the Father and the exalted Son. In short, a considerable majority of the New Testament evinces the influence of Psalm 110:1 in the interpretation of the Easter experience.

The identification of the status of the risen Jesus, with the help of the Psalm, testifies to an apparently basic christological conviction which is correctly described by Ferdinand Hahn as follows: "The idea of exaltation ... in the New Testament ... is consistently connected with a certain Old Testament citation: Ps. 110:1 became the authoritative statement of Jesus' heavenly status and function."² The persistent use of Ps. 110:1 to articulate its experience of the risen Jesus, therefore, discloses how the earliest Christian community deliberately made the lofty claim that Jesus was not simply raised from among the dead but also exalted to God's right hand, i.e. to share the throne with God. The application of the Psalm in the interpretation of the disciples' experience of the risen Jesus proved to be of immense significance not only for the earliest Christian communities but for the later christological development as well.

Ps. 110:1 contains three different elements: the introductory statement containing the expression *kyrios*, the motif of the accession to the right hand, and the formulation of 110:1b according to which the enthroned

² F. HAHN, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (New York: World) 127.

receives the promise of the final victory over his enemies. Even though each of the three aspects was influential in its own way in the development of early christology, the most influential element was the central statement of the 'sitting at the right hand.'³

The authentic letters of Paul contain but two clear allusions to Ps. 110:1, namely, Rom 8:34; 1Cor. 15:28. The way Paul makes the allusion, however, does not seem to suggest that the Psalm was of no particular significance at that time. On the contrary, it gives the impression that the period of its influence in the formation of christology was already gone. Several factors point to such a conclusion. Many texts, including the two Pauline references, exhibit a certain consistency both in order and in language (Christ, death, resurrection and Ps. 110:1). Such a recurring order seems to point to an oral tradition which grew out of an expansion of the so-called *Pistis-formula* (cf. 1Cor. 15:3b-5). Again, most of the New Testament allusions to the Psalm appear as a sitting *en dextra*.⁴ It marks a difference with the normal Greek usage in the LXX, in the Jewish pseudepigrapha and in the later Apostolic Fathers, where almost exclusively the much more common expression is *ek dexion*. This variation suggests that the use of the Psalm in association with the statements about Christ's death and resurrection originated already in the Aramaic-speaking communities which probably depended on an alternative translation of the

Hebrew text, independent of the LXX.⁵ Moreover, Paul seems to presuppose a knowledge of the christological themes connected with Ps. 110:1 in the Christian communities of Rome and Corinth. He, therefore, uses the Psalm without feeling any urgency to explain the reasons for the association.⁶

Hence, the essential element of the Easter experience was that of exaltation of Jesus rather than of just survival or resuscitation of the corpse. Such an idea is well-supported by the available New Testament data. On the basis of the apostolic interpretation of the Easter experience, with the help of Ps. 110:1, it becomes all the more clear that the conviction that the risen Jesus Christ is now a *highly exalted figure* goes back to the earliest available stage of Christianity, namely, to the Aramaic-speaking congregation of Jerusalem. Psalm 110:1, therefore, is not simply of fundamental significance for the interpretation of the earliest passages which speak of the resurrection but constitutes an important starting point for early christology. Through the mediation of the Psalm, the resurrected one is confessed to be in an almost unprecedented proximity to God, which is viewed in terms of the *commonality of the throne*.

One of the most important consequences of the interpretation of the resurrection as exaltation at God's right hand is the application of the title (*ho*) *Kyrios* to Jesus. Although positive evidences regarding the connection

³ W.R.G. LOADER, "Christ at the Right Hand – Ps. CX.1 in the New Testament," *New Testament Studies* (24 1978) 208.

⁴ Acts 2:33 and 5:31 read *te dextra*.

⁵ M. HENGEL, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995) 141.

⁶ D.M. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973), 39ff.

between the Psalm and the title are lacking, the interpretation of the resurrection with the help of the Psalm may still be the most likely source of the Christian usage of the title, for the notion of exaltation and the sharing of the throne with God evidently entailed a sharing of the ultimate power and authority of God over the universe.

The title *Kyrios* is applied to Jesus with various nuances by different New Testament writers. However, the background of the title and its implication are matters of heated debate in scholarly circles. In view of the varied use of the title, different hypotheses have been proposed regarding its origin and meaning.

There is, first of all, the suggestion that the title has a secular rather than a religious origin. On this suggestion, the New Testament title *ho Kyrios* derives from the vocative *Kyrie* which denotes a polite form of address, meaning *sir* or *master*. In this sense, it was a term conveying respect. However, that the use of the title *Kyrios* for Jesus derives from such a usage is a suggestion without anything to substantiate it.

On a second opinion it originated in Greek-speaking Jewish-Christian communities, by which is often meant Christian communities in the Jewish Diaspora. This assumption puts too much weight on the premise of the LXX translation of the Sacred Tetragramm (YHWH) into *Kyrios*. Although the significant role of the LXX in the introduction of the title cannot be ignored, the hypothesis that the application of the title

to Jesus was first made possible by the LXX is not very convincing.

According to a third group, the title was taken over from the Eastern Mediterranean Pagan milieu where different gods and human rulers were addressed as *Kyrios*. Characteristic to this opinion, which once enjoyed wide scholarly support, is a contrast between *invocation* and *acclamation*, and the identification of the latter as a derivation from sources alien to Christianity. Ever since the publication of Bousset's influential work, the wedge was driven deeply between *invocation* and *acclamation*. It is then alleged that whereas the early Palestinian Semitic community 'invoked Jesus as lord' (sir) using the formula *marana tha*, Jesus was not 'acclaimed as the Lord' until new dimensions were introduced into Christian thinking through the influence of surrounding pagan saviour-cults.⁷ The view, however, seems to be inadequate on several counts. First of all, the position cannot adequately explain the unmistakably religious connotation – for instance, of 1Cor. 8:5-6 – of the title as applied to Jesus. Secondly, that the title was first applied to Jesus in such communities largely remains an unsupported assumption. As Oscar Cullmann rightly observes, "it can by no means be proved that Hellenistic Churches were the first to worship Jesus as divine. It can be proved neither by the philological observations ..., nor by the fact that *kyrios* was a designation for Hellenistic gods."⁸ Thirdly, even though the Hellenistic usage could have considerably influenced the Christian usage of the title, to insist that it was the sole

⁷ The view is systematically presented in W. BOUSSET, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913).

⁸ O. CULLMANN, *The Christology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1959) 198.

background of the title is to leave many things unexplained. One such important aspect is the recurring presence of the title in passages that derive from the traditional material like Phil. 2:5-11.⁹ A more important difficulty concerns the problem of distinguishing between the Hellenists and the Hebrews. From the book of Acts (esp. 6:1-6), it is clear that both groups existed already in the Jewish Christian community of Palestine. C.F.D. Moule, on the basis of the meagre evidence available, proposes the following interpretation: "The main objection to the traditional interpretation of the word [*Hellenistai*] as 'Greek-speaking' Jews is that Paul, who demonstrably spoke Greek, called himself [*Hebraioi*] (2Co 11²², Ph 3⁵) – the very word with which [*Hellenistes*] is expressly contrasted. My suggestion is that this difficulty is obviated if ... the meaning attaching to [*Hellenistai*] and [*Hebraioi*] in given contexts are, respectively, 'Jews who spoke only Greek,' and 'Jews, who while able to speak Greek, knew a Semitic language also.'¹⁰ Then the distinction is one within the Palestinian Jewish Christianity itself. In the light of this distinction, the whole question regarding the early kerygmatic formulation of Palestinian Christianity should be asked anew. If the Palestinian Christianity itself contained elements of Hellenism and if there are evidences for the absolute use of the title *kyrios* for God in the Hebrew and Aramaic literature of the period, it seems more convincing to see the emergence of the title among the

Jewish *Hebraioi* of Palestine itself rather than among the Hellenistic Christianity of a pagan environment.

Precisely at this point, the most fatal blow to the third view, which once enjoyed wide scholarly support, is issued by J.A. Fitzmyer, who introduces a different instance of the absolute use of the title from a *Palestinian Jewish background*. He traces the absolute use of *Mara* for God in different texts like the targum of Job, *Genesis Apocryphon* and 4QEnoch as well as in the Greek writings of Josephus, the Letter of Aristeas and Aquila's translation of the Old Testament. In such evidences, Fitzmyer finds a custom, albeit incipient, among Jews of Palestine of referring to Yahweh as "the Lord." Hence, for him, although the equation $\text{YHWH} = \text{Mara} = \text{Kyrios}$ is still an impossible one, 'Palestinian Jews, who were able to refer to God as *Mara* could on becoming the *Hebraioi* of the Palestinian Christian community, transfer the title to Jesus.' Thus the absolute usage of "the Lord" as a NT christological title can be traced to the primitive Palestinian Christian community.¹¹

Evidences are, therefore, in favour of the conclusion that the risen One was addressed as *Kyrios* already in the earliest Palestinian Jewish Christian community. The appeal to the exalted Christ as *maran* in the acclamation *maranatha* most probably reflects its use as a christological title.

⁹ ERNST LOHMEYER, *Der Brief an die Philipper*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928; 14th ed., rev. by W. Schmauch 1974) 90. Elsewhere he wrote about the origin of the hymn as follows: "wohl ursprünglich griechisch geschrieben ist, aber von einem Dichter, dessen Muttersprache semitisch war." *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2.5-11* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1928, 2nd edition 1961) 9.

¹⁰ C.F.D. MOULE, "Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?," *Expository Times* 60 (1958-59) 100.

¹¹ J.A. FITZMYER, *A Wandering Aramean* (Missoula: Scholars, 1979) 123-7.

The Exalted Lord in Christian Faith and Piety

The title, nonetheless, entailed a wide range of usages and meanings in the surviving Aramaic texts relevant to the period as well as in biblical Greek. Therefore, it does not automatically imply that the one addressed by the term is seen inevitably as divine. However, since one can trace instances where the term is used as a title for God already in writings belonging to pre-Christian Aramaic Jewish setting, nothing compels one to presume that the title was totally incapable of evoking a divine connotation during the earliest stage of Christianity. It now remains to consider whether the New Testament provides good reasons for concluding that the use of the title *Kyrios* for Christ did connote the conviction that he had been made to share in divine glory and transcendence and, therefore, was to be revered in terms and actions characteristically reserved for God alone. Although the New Testament contains several important factors in this regard, the present attention falls on three significant features, namely, the role of Jesus in the Christian confession of God, the cultic veneration of Jesus, and the attribution to him of cosmic lordship.

The most important text regarding the first is 1Cor. 8:6. The text represents a Pauline interpretation of the Jewish Shema prayer (Deut. 6:4-5). Paul, here, identifies 'God' as the Father and 'Lord' as Jesus Christ, thereby placing Jesus as Lord alongside God the

Father.¹² Written slightly more than two decades after Jesus' crucifixion, the text summarizes the distinctive feature of early Christian faith and devotion. On the one hand, Paul proclaims his monotheistic faith with an unqualified rejection of a plurality of deities and thus distinguishes his own Christian faith and devotion from other varieties of faiths and devotions widespread in the pagan world of his day. On the other hand, by juxtaposing the one God and the Lord Jesus, the text equally distinguishes early Christian faith and piety from those of the Jewish tradition. By this juxtaposition, Paul expands the Shema, the traditional Jewish confession of the uniqueness of the one God, to include Lord Jesus Christ within the divine realm.¹³ If one likewise recognizes an allusion to the Jewish confession, the Shema, which in its Greek form used both *Theos* and *Kyrios* as titles for Yahweh, one has reasons to hold that 1Cor. 8:6 involved a reinterpretation of Jewish monotheism itself. Commenting on the text, O'Collins writes: "Using the classic monotheistic text of Judaism, Paul recast his perception of God by introducing Jesus as 'Lord' and redefining Jewish monotheism to produce a christological monotheism."¹⁴ L.W. Hurtado, who regards the text as a classical instance of Paul's summarizing the nature of early Christian devotion, holds that the text testifies to a mutation or innovation to the Jewish monotheistic faith brought about by attaching an important place to the risen Lord in Christian devotional practice thereby

¹² G. O'COLLINS, *Christology* (New York: Oxford University, 1996) 17. Also his "Images of Jesus: Reappropriating Titular Christology," *Theology Digest* 44 (1997) 308.

¹³ J.D.G. DUNN, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM, 1980) 180.

¹⁴ G. O'COLLINS, *Christology*, 137.

rendering it in a 'binitarian shape.'¹⁵ According to Elwell, the text, which, in his view, is an apologetic construction, makes little difference between God and Lord Jesus.¹⁶ Although the expansion provoked criticism from the strictly monotheistic Jewish perspective, the early Jewish Christians, like Paul, seemingly felt fully justified in assigning to the risen Jesus a place within the divine sphere and, at the same time, professed faith in the *One God of their fathers*.

Secondly, as a partaker in divine transcendence, the risen Lord became the object of adoration and was directly addressed in prayer by the earliest Christian communities. Although according to the New Testament, early Christian prayers are characteristically addressed to God the Father,¹⁷ there are also instances where the exalted Christ was directly addressed in prayer. 1Cor. 16:22 offers the most classical example of the direct addressing of Christ in prayer. Commenting on the text, David Brown writes: "... it might legitimately be inferred that the primitive ejaculation of *Maran-atha* (Come, O Lord!), as recorded by Paul ..., may well be indicative of cries uttered in worship directly to the Risen Christ without thought of ultimate reference to the Father."¹⁸ Moreover, the Aramaic rendering of the acclamation within the Greek body is indicative of the antiquity and frequency of the prayer. Acts 7:59-60 depicts Stephen appealing to the Son

of Man who is standing at the right hand of God with the petitions, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and "Lord, do not hold this sin against them." They are quite evidently direct requests to Jesus. Another possible evidence of prayer to the Christ is Acts 1:24, where the community requests the "Lord" to disclose them who is to replace Judas Iscariot as one of the apostles. An almost certain example of repeated prayerful petition to the exalted Christ is 2Cor. 12:2-10, where Paul witnesses that he "besought the Lord" three times concerning a personal affliction and received the Lord's answer: "my grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness." Equally important are the Pauline greetings and benedictions.

Evidence, therefore, indicates that the risen and exalted Lord was repeatedly addressed to and besought in prayer by the faithful already in the earliest available stage of the Christian religion. This fixed place of the exalted Christ in early devotional practices indicates the divine status he occupied in early Christian worship. After a brief discussion of these prayers, Wainwright makes the following conclusion:

The readiness of first-century Christians to pray to Christ is strong evidence of their belief in his divinity The prayers which have been quoted show that he received prayer in his own right and was believed to have

¹⁵ L.W. HURTADO, *One God, One Lord* (London: SCM, 1988) 1-2, 97.

¹⁶ W.A. ELWELL, "The Deity of Christ in the Writings of Paul," in GERALD F. HAWTHORNE (ed.), *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honour of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1975) 305.

¹⁷ Typical are Paul's reports about his prayer for his churches (e.g., Rom. 1:8-10; 1Cor. 1:4; 2Cor. 1:3-4; Phil. 1:3-5; 1Thess. 1:2-3; Philemon 4). Another example is Paul's appeal to the believers in Rome to pray to God for the success of his trip to Jerusalem (Rom. 15:30-33).

¹⁸ D. BROWN, *The Divine Trinity* (London: Duckworth, 1985) 150.

power to answer the request which are made to him. Since Christians addressed their prayers only to Father and to Christ, and avoided praying to angels or patriarchs, the fact that Christ was thought worthy to receive prayers in the same way as his Father, suggests that his followers ranked him with the Father.¹⁹

Richard Bauckham argues that the christological significance of the early Christian acknowledgement of Jesus as worthy of worship cannot be easily underrated. "That the highest Christology, including the direct ascription of the title 'God' to Jesus, seems to have occurred earliest in contexts of worship, has often be noticed, but sometimes with the implication that it should therefore be taken less seriously. In fact, on the contrary, if it is in worship that monotheism is tested in religious practice, the devotional attitude to Jesus in worship is the critical test of Christology." He argued that the attitude "had the effect, probably more clearly than any other Christological theme available in their world of ideas, of placing Jesus on the divine side of the line which monotheism must draw between God and creatures."²⁰

Thirdly, another feature of New Testament christology which necessitates a redefinition of Jewish monotheism is the acknowledgement of Christ as the agent of and Lord over the entire creation. The one who is resurrected and exalted to the right hand of God receives dominion over the whole universe in an unparalleled manner. David Brown writes:

In fact, the truth seems to be that from the Resurrection onwards this exalted figure was conceived of as having had enormous powers delegated to him, so extensive that the only possible appropriate description of him is to assign him the status of divinity, whatever the disciples' intention may have been. Thus, for example, St. Paul clearly tells us in his First Epistle to the Corinthians that Christ's kingdom extends over all that exists and will last to the end, and 'when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject to him that put all things under him, that God might be all in all' (15:28). In other words, although he is eventually to return his power to the Father, for the moment he is conceived of as exercising absolute, independent sway over the world. It is the same kind of pattern that we find in the Resurrection accounts in the Gospels.²¹

Confessing Jesus' cosmic Lordship also entailed recognizing him as the agent of creation. The risen One not simply is the eschatological judge and the actual Lord of history, but participates in a divine prerogative of creation.

Conclusion

The basic content of the foregoing argument is that divinity was attributed to the risen Christ already in the earliest available stage of Christian life. As repeatedly admitted by exegetes, very rarely does the New Testament call Jesus *Theos*; even the rare cases occur only in texts that are relatively late and involve


¹⁹ A. W. WAINWRIGHT, *The Trinity in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1962) 100-1.

²⁰ R. BAUCKHAM, "The Worship of Jesus in Apocalyptic Christianity," *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981) 322-41; citations from 322, 335.

²¹ D. BROWN, *The Divine Trinity*, 150-1.

considerable textual as well as exegetical ambiguity. However, the Christian confession of faith and practice of devotion as exemplified in the New Testament unmistakably testify to the commitment and reverence Christians accorded to the risen Jesus in terms of divinity. He was somehow regarded as divine, as being on par with God. However, Jesus was never identified with the one whom he called Abba. Jesus' being on par with God is to be understood not in an identifying sense but in an egalitarian sense. It involves a juxtaposition but not substitution or identification.

Jesus' Lordship, therefore, is not to be understood as the attribution of a distinct and different one from that of the Father. But it is a sharing in the Lordship of the Father. The title *Lord* reveals Jesus' unique relationship with God who is called the Father. The New Testament does not speak about two Lordships and two thrones, but only of a sharing of the Lordship and of a commonality of the throne. Hence, New Testament attribution of Lordship and divinity to the risen Jesus is fully consistent with monotheistic faith and the notion of unity of God.



MALABAR DELEGATION OF 1796 TO BAGHDAD; A PRELUDE TO PANDARI SCHISM

Dr. James Puliurumpil

The last years of 18th century was an eventful period in the history of the Syro-Malabar Church. Baghdad delegation, Paul Pandari got ordained as bishop by the Chaldean Church authority, death of Governador Paremakal, election of a new administrator, Pandari Schism and the Reunion efforts were all remarkable events to be noted in history. A lot of confusions and unrest reigned the Malabar Church during this period. With the death of Thomas Paremakal, the Governador of the archdiocese of Kodungalloor, on March 20, 1799 The Church of the Mar Thoma Christians had to witness a series of unpleasant events which really tarnished the image of the Church. The most important of these events was a schism, initiated and led by Paul Pandari; hence in history is known as Pandari schism. Here we see the delegation to Baghdad which is a very important event as a prelude to the Pandari Schism.

1. The Background of Pandari Schism

Although the schism following the death of Thomas Paremakal did not affect the whole Church in Malabar, it was the result of a long cherished desire of the Syrians, who were weary of the European missionaries, to

get a native bishop as their prelate. The Syrian Catholic community of Malabar, divided under the two jurisdictions of Padroado and Propaganda, was dissatisfied. The death of Mar Cariattil aggravated the situation as the people considered that his death put an end to the hope they dreamed of for so long. During the time of the reign of Paramakkal in Kodungalloor, they had the occasion to come together in order to strengthen themselves by standing together for their cause. As long as Paremakal was the governor there seemed no chance for a schism and only after his death did there originate a chance for schism. But the presence of Mar Paul Pandari, who had been ordained bishop in Baghdad by the administrator of the Chaldean Patriarch, in Malabar was the real and proximate cause for the origin of schism in the Malabar Church.

2. The Deputation to Baghdad

In September 1796 a group of four persons from Malabar were sent to the Chaldean Patriarch in Baghdad. Of these four, two were from the same family of Pandari, called Paul and his younger brother Joseph. The other two were another Paul and then an Antony¹. Pandaris were from the parish of

¹ Mar John Haruthiun, administrator of the diocese of Isphan in Iraq while writing a letter on November 25, 1796, to the Congregation of Propaganda Fide mentions the name of these four persons from Malabar, telling that Joseph is only 12 years of old and is the brother of Paul, the leader of this group. The letter can be seen in APF, SOCG 907, f. 359v, as quoted in James Puliurumpil, *A Period of Jurisdictional Conflict in the Suriani Church of India (1800-1838)*, Rome, Gregorian University, 1993. p. 7

Puthenchira in Irinjalakuda. Paul Pandari was the leader of this group. Whether these four represented the Malabar Church or did it for themselves is a question of uncertainty according to the documents. None of these was a cleric, nor an elder; but were all youth. The leader of the group, Paul Pandari, was seventeen. Those times, fifteen or seventeen were, of course, good age for taking risk and also for adjusting to the situations, whether favourable or adverse.

These four² took with them some letters from Malabar to be handed over to the patriarch. The letters were of their king Rama Rajah and of their clergy and of all the people. The letters were addressed to Joseph IV, Chaldean patriarch of Mosul³. One of these letters was from the Diwan of the Rajah of Travancore, the land of the Syrians. Other letters were both from the Catholic and Syrian Orthodox Thomas Christians. The important letter, written by the clergy and the faithful of Malabar comprises of 24 sheets⁴. The purpose of their coming to Baghdad was clearly stated in this letter.

2.1. Their grievances

The content of this letter was the grievances of the Christians of Malabar and their complaints against the Carmelite missionaries, set out as follows:

They present a very grave petition against the Latin missionaries, i.e. the Carmelite missionaries who work in Malabar, saying that the latter had a detestable behaviour and they became a common hatred to the people not only because of their dishonesty but also because of their disregard of the people. And it is because of their work that a Chaldean bishop was drowned and then Mar Cariattil was poisoned to death. They had sent many times many letters to Rome via Portugal with the intention of informing the Sacred Congregation of their grievances and to have an answer. But all their letters were interceded by the Carmelite missionaries. Once one native who happened to see these letters kept in the house of the missionaries took them and brought them to the Malabar clergy. Then they decided to find a remedy for this and not to obey the Carmelites even though they would become heretics or idolators. Sixty-two churches selected one priest to make him bishop, declining all obedience to the Latins. The Carmelites then told the government to punish them. And to avoid further molestation they protested of not having any more relation with the Franks who have their superiors in this nation. And therefore the government obliges them to turn to Baghdad to have ministers for their cult and the king himself writes to the patriarch, so also the leaders of the Church in Malabar⁵.

² There are historians who differ in the number of persons in the group. Hambye is of the opinion that there were only three in the group. But the group, indeed, was formed of four persons. As one among them is only 12 years of age he is not being counted among others. This is clear from the letter of Mar John Haruthiun to the Propaganda Congregation on November 25, 1796. In this letter while writing about the this boy of twelve, Mar John expresses his wish to send this boy of twelve to the College of Propaganda Fide to give him priestly training as he is found to be a boy of very good character. For details see J. Pulurumpil, *A Period of Jurisdictional Conflict*, p. 8

³ He was also called patriarch of Ninive or patriarch of Babylon

⁴ These letters can be seen in the Archives of Propaganda Fide in the sections: APF, SOCG 907; APF, Acta 168; ACO, Ponenze I (Caldei)

⁵ APF, Acta 168, ff. 183v-184v, as quoted in J. Pulurumpil, *A Period of Jurisdictional Conflict*, p. 8

After having narrated the small history of the problems and troubles in the Church of the Syrians in Malabar, the letter requests the patriarch to send the necessary authorities to their Church to rule and guide them. The letter again shows the dislike the faithful had of the Carmelite missionaries who were then their rulers. The dislike is so intense that the faithful were ready even to become heretics than to obey the foreign missionaries. They continuously make the request that their grievances should not be left unheard.

3. Delegation in Baghdad

In November 1796 the delegation reached Baghdad. No prior information was given to Baghdad regarding their visit. Therefore the authorities in Baghdad were really surprised to have received them. It is not clear how this group was formed, on what ground and by what criteria. It is also not clear whether was it just to inform the patriarch of their desire and need to get a bishop or also to have their request executed soon; also whether it was so planned one among them, most probably Paul Pandari that he would be ordained bishop. As soon as they reached Baghdad the delegation showed their interest to see the patriarch and to submit the letters to him.

Although the deputation was directed to the Chaldean patriarch Joseph IV, and the letters were addressed to him personally, the administrator of the patriarch, Mar John Hormez received the delegation and opened the letters. The fact that Joseph IV died in Rome in 1791 was not known to the faithful in Malabar while they were writing the letters.

That is the reason why the letters were addressed to the patriarch. From 1791 Mar John Hormez was ruling the Church as administrator of the Church. Therefore he had the right to receive the delegation and also to open the letters addressed to the patriarch.

The Thomas Christians got to know the name of Joseph VI through the Syrian Orthodox clergy who visited Malabar. They were at times coming to Malabar from Mardin, which is about 100 kms. away from Diarbekir. According to the historian Hambye, the Syrians of Malabar might have heard about the patriarch through the Carmelite missionaries⁶. Another possibility, as Mar John Hormez held, is through the priests who had done their studies at the Propaganda College, Rome.

3.1. Hormez, the rightful authority

Since 1791 Mar John Hormez was functioning as the administrator of the Chaldean patriarch. Towards the end of the eighteenth century the Chaldean Church or the ancient Church of the East was a kingdom divided against itself, for it had three patriarchs at loggerheads with each other. Elias XII (1778) could rightly claim to be the successor of the original line of catholicos-patriarch who can be traced back at least to 498 A.D. They resided at the famed monastery of Rabban Hormizd near Alkosh. The second patriarchate, the existence of which was originally due to the union with Rome of Simon VIII Sulaqa in 1553 remained catholic until the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Since 1672, a movement towards Catholicism

⁶ E.R. Hambye, *Mar Paulos Abraham Pandari, Bishop in Malabar, and his relations with Mesopotamia*, in Madey J. and Kaniarakath Geogre (eds.), *The Church I Love*, Kottayam, 1984, p. 84.

in the reign of Diarbekir had become so active that its Assyrian metropolitan, Joseph, firmly adhered to Rome and in 1681 became a patriarch. However the Roman authorities conferred on him only the title of 'patriarch of the Chaldeans' without any particular locality or region attached to the function. In 1775 his successor, Joseph IV, was the only one of those three patriarchs to be united with Rome.

Elias XII had two nephews whom he ordained bishop metropolitan at an early age, so that his succession would be secure. The first called Isoyahb was also 'Guardian of the See' and was to become the next patriarch of the line. Some years later the other nephew also became bishop metropolitan under the name of John Hormez. Later he replaced Isoyahb as 'Guardian of the See', thus becoming the official candidate to the patriarchal succession. At the death of Elias XII in 1778, Isoyahb convinced of his rights was enthroned as Elias XIII, for some time showing sympathy for the reunion movement in Mosul and neighbourhood but ending by rejecting it altogether until his death. On the contrary, his cousin, John Hormez riding on the waves of the union movement, joined the Catholic Church and in 1783 he was fully acknowledged by Pope Pius VI as archbishop metropolitan of Mosul and administrator of the patriarch of Babylon. These latter responsibilities were extended in 1791 to the dioceses thus far depending on the Diarbekir patriarchate. The last holder, Joseph IV, resigned in 1781, but died only ten years later in 1791. That is the reason why the report of the General Assembly of March 30, 1801 of

Propaganda Fide wrote: "Mar John Hormez (Monsignor John of Ormisda) archbishop and administrator of the Chaldean patriarch of Ninve or Mosul converted about 20 years ago to the Catholic faith from Nestorianism..."⁷

The letters, which the delegation brought expressing the grave disorders in Malabar requested the patriarch to provide for that nation one bishop, two priests and some clerics. The letter upheld that the whole clergy and people were protesting and, therefore, they should be made quiet and be preserved in the catholic faith, adhering to the Holy See. The letters again say that the heretics, viz. the Syrian Jacobites, have promised to come to the Catholic faith; otherwise all have determined to become heretics and idolators rather than depend upon the Latin missionaries.

4. Letters to Rome

Mar John gave the Malabar delegation a cordial welcome. Understanding the seriousness and urgency of the situation from the letters, Mar John wrote to the Congregation of Propaganda Fide on November 25, 1796 describing the situation and the request for help. He wrote to the Congregation that he could not remain passive because the delegation came with a very special purpose of solving the problems of the Malabar Church. Their hardships for the last four months are to be taken into account. Their request for a bishop should not left unheard from his part. In his letter Mar John showed no doubt regarding his right of jurisdiction over the Malabar Christians. He claimed that his predecessors had

⁷ APF, Acta 168, f. 183r, as quoted in J. Puliurumpil, *A Period of Jurisdictional Conflict*, p. 9

exercised power over the Syrians in Malabar. He had his own justification for this claim⁸. He wrote to the Propaganda Congregation that:

His predecessors had always exercised such a right over the Chaldeans in Malabar, saying that the letters and other ancient documents show that the patriarch of Alkosh, although Nestorians had sent the bishop in Malabar. This was confirmed also with the letters brought by these four messengers⁹.

4.1. Right over the Malabar Church

Mar John held the view that with all justice he should provide for the urgent needs of Christians of Malabar because they were conational and they were also now directed to him. John Hormez says so because there arose a problem with regard to the right over the Syrians of Malabar. According to Fr. Fulgentius, the Apostolic Vicar of Babylonia, it seemed that a contention arose between John Hormez and Michael Jarweh, who had become since 1783, not only the elected successor of his Syrian Orthodox George IV, but also the first Syrian Catholic patriarch of modern times to succeed in forming a Syro-Antiochean Church united to Rome. Each of the prelates pretended that the Christians of Malabar fell to their care. Owing to the existence of a Syrian Orthodox

community of Thomas Christians and to the fact that some of them had signed the above-mentioned letter addressed to Joseph IV, it was clear that why Michael Jarweh could make some claims.

It is all probable that during the stay at Baghdad, Hormez told the deputation to have nothing to do with Fr. Fulgentius, the then Apostolic Vicar of Babylonia. The Letter who had been nominated apostolic visitor of the Chaldeans at Mosul and Diarbekir and had visited the place in 1795-96, interviewed the metropolitan on the arrival of the deputation from Malabar. The only information he could receive was that they had come to ask for a bishop. Fulgentius advised him not to intervene in the Malabar affairs without an expressed order from Rome. However, without expecting a hurried reply from the Congregation John Hormez wanted to give at once the desired pastors to the Christians of Malabar.

On the same day John of Haruthiun, the administrator of the diocese of Ispahan in Persia, also wrote to the Congregation of Propaganda Fide regarding the same subject¹⁰. He described clearly in his letter the bad examples of the missionaries in the Orient. He wrote: "Contrary to the past, the religious missionaries who by their examples and with

⁸ Mar John's claim of jurisdiction over the Malabar Church is a complex issue. The Persian Church kept always good relations with the Malabar Church is a fact beyond doubt. But the extent and intensity of this relation, or the so-called jurisdiction, is so far clear to none. Again, with the Synod of Diamper, the relationship with these two Churches was done away with. For details see F.E. Keay, *A History of the Syrian Church in Kerala*, Madras 1950; George Rae, *The Syrian Church in India*, London 1892.

⁹ J. Puliurumpil, *A Period of Jurisdictional Conflict*, p. 11

¹⁰ The letter of Mar John Haruthiun can be seen in the Propaganda Archives, APF, SOCG 907. As Mar John was a friend of Mar Cariattil in the Propaganda College, it was he who informed the Congregation of the death of Mar Cariattil. In this letter he wrote that the death of Cariattil was not a natural one, but he was indeed poisoned to death.

sane doctrines sowed the Divine Word and the way of salvation, at present with their bad examples and worse principles taint the poor Christianity"¹¹. He also included an account of the letter of the Christians of Malabar, together with a summary extract of their laments.

On December 20th Mar John Hormez wrote again to Propaganda Fide Congregation. Since he felt that he should send a bishop to the Chaldeans in Malabar or in other places distant from Persia, he requested the Pope to give him the faculty to authorize bishops, to elect and ordain bishops who could be worthy and acceptable to the people. And he asked these faculties explicitly for Malabar¹².

5. Paul Pandari got ordained bishop

Without having obtained the answer from the Congregation, Mar John Hormez decided to ordain Paul Pandari, one of the four from the deputation and to send him to Malabar. Thus after 16 months of stay at Baghdad Paul Pandari was consecrated bishop by the Archbishop Mar John Hormez, the administrator of the Chaldean patriarch¹³. First he was ordained priest and then consecrated bishop *in partibus* as Mar Abraham. He was ordained not for Malabar but as titular bishop for the monastery of St. Behnan near Mosul which was almost in ruins but had once bishops.

The monastery of St. Behnan is situated in the plains of Mosul and belonged to the Syrian Catholics since the first decades of the 19th century. This century-old monastery never depended on the catholicate of the East¹⁴. Mar Pandari's written profession of faith was then sent to Rome. After the consecration he returned to Malabar with two priests named Hormez Bekana d'Armuta and Joseph d'Ainkawa. These two priests are from Baghdad and of the Chaldean rite. The delegation with these Chalden priests left for Bombay via Basra at the end of February or early March and reached Kochi at the end of March.

The presence of Pandari in Malabar was the real cause of the schism which occurred in 1799, following the death of Thomas Paremakal. The period from the return of Pandari in Malabar i.e., March 1797 and the death of Paremakal in 1799 is a smooth period in the history of the Malabar Church. Pandari remained in Malabar without creating any problem. Neither Thomas Paremakal nor the Vicar Apsotolic did receive him as a rightful bishop. Death of Paremakal in March 1799 was the occasion for Pandari to come to the front of the Malabar Church, which resulted in a short-lived schism, known in history as the Pandari schism, and a number of consequent events which troubled the Church of the St. Thomas Christians.

¹¹ APF, SOCG 907, f. 359r, as quoted in J. Puliurumpil, *A Period of jurisdictional Conflict*, p. 12

¹² APF, Acta 168, f. 185v. This is the second letter from Baghdad to Rome. The first one was left unanswered from the part of Rome was due to the troubles in Rome created by the French revolutionary army during the time of the French revolution.

¹³ Sixteen months of stay meant that the delegation arrived at Baghdad in November 1796, and Pandari as bishop returned to Malabar in February or early March 1798.

¹⁴ It is probable that Mar John Hormez chose this title to Paul Pandari in order to make the new bishop acceptable to the Syrian Orthodox Thomas Christians. In their church of Angamaly there is an 18th century painting of the martyr St. Behnan, which could indicate that this saint was known to the faithful in Malabar for some time past.

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN HISTORY AND FAITH: A REFLECTION

Dr. Jose Palakeel

Introduction

The concept of history is understood in diverse ways. In our discussion, history obviously denotes the modern critical history, although that notion, too, is not univocal. The concept of faith is no different as regards its plurivocity. However, the term, "faith," in this dissertation denotes traditional Christian faith.¹ The Enlightenment - inspired, nineteenth-century research into the historical facticity of biblical accounts apparently led to a divorce between Christian faith and its historical foundations. However, it has now become obvious that the issue at stake is not that simple. This article aims at formulating a methodology for a plausible bridging of the gap between history and faith in the context of the third quest of the historical Jesus. After an initial survey of the possible relationships

between history and faith, I will attempt to construct a plausible framework for approaching historical research with due regard for the traditional faith of the Church.² In doing that, my primary concern is to argue in favor of the basic historicity of the narratives of the New Testament, and particularly, the canonical Gospels.

1. The Significance of History for Christian Faith

1.1 History, Faith, and Jesus Studies

Academic history is categorised today as part of humanities or social sciences.³ As such it is not included among the natural sciences. This implies that nature is not the primary interest of historians. According to Fuller, the subject matter of history is human behaviour.⁴ In Collingwood we find a clearer definition

1. R. Kendall Soulen states that traditionally the Church interpreted the Bible theologically. According to him this "traditional theological interpretation" of the Bible could be described as "an approach to understanding the Bible that has as its central concern true knowledge of God and faithful orientation in the world. Like other interpretive approaches, theological interpretation has distinctive presuppositions and aims. The main presupposition of theological interpretation is that the Bible is sacred scripture, that is, it has its origin, subject matter, and purpose in God. The central aim of theological interpretation is to understand sacred scripture as sacred scripture, namely in a manner that critically advances knowledge of God and orientation in the world." See R. Kendall Soulen, "The Believer and the Historian: Theological Interpretation and Historical Investigation," *Interpretation* 57 (2003) 174-186, 177.
2. When I use the term "the Church," I intend mainline Christianity. For me, mainline Christianity is represented by the Roman Catholic Church. However, the term "the Church" in this paper does not exclude the Protestant churches in so far as they hold similar Christological positions as that of the Roman Catholic Church.
3. L. M. McDonald & S.E. Porter, *Early Christianity and its Sacred Literature* (Massachusetts, 2000) 4.
4. Daniel P. Fuller, *Easter Faith and History* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1965) 24.

of history. According to him, it is “(a) a science, or an answering of questions; (b) concerned with human actions in the past; (c) pursued by interpretation of evidence; and (d) for the sake of human self-knowledge.”⁵ P. Gardiner and Karl Jaspers affirm that history is limited to enquiry into reality in the past.⁶ Daniels, while agreeing with Jaspers that history is the past experience of humankind, modifies the concept by stating that it is “the memory of the past experience as it has been preserved largely in written records.”⁷ Even without referring to historical positivism,⁸ it is possible to sense from the above-mentioned opinions what historians are generally concerned with. That is to say, historians are concerned (1) with past events that are directly related to human beings and (2) “with those events that happen within the space-time continuum.”⁹ These two concerns of historians are also in fact two limitations of history because they make it impossible the science of history to enter effectively into the investigation of past events that do not fall under these two categories.¹⁰

One of the most significant and widely discussed issues concerning the discipline of history is the issue of objectivity in historical research. Today it is generally recognised that pure, objective historical knowledge is impossible. The task of the historian is not only to ascertain facts, but also to interpret them. It is the interpretation of facts that generates meaning. Interpretation is possible only from some standpoint, which involves certain presuppositions. This is the area that determines the differences of meanings that different historians arrive at from the same data. Walsh affirms “that there is a subjective element in every historical enquiry that determines what the historian will accept or reject.”¹¹ History” he asserts, “is always written from a particular point of view, a phrase which includes the acceptance of a certain moral outlook.”¹² Objectivity, which is one of the characteristics of so-called scientific knowledge, is not absolutely possible in historiography. For instance. “it would be difficult to find a British historian who would

5. R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1980 [1946]) 10-11.

6. P. Gardiner, *The Nature of Historical Explanation* (London, 1968) ix; Karl Jaspers, *Philosophical Faith and Revelation* (ET: London, 1967) 186.

7. R.V. Daniels. “History: 1. Methodology,” in *Encyclopedia Americana*, 22 vols. (New York, 1971) 14: 226-229, 226.

8. McDonald & Porter recapitulate Collingwood’s definition of historical positivism [idea of History, 126-130]. Accordingly, it is “a philosophy acting in the service of natural science, whose duties include the ascertaining of facts obtained by sense perception. Laws are then framed by inductive method, and from this a positivistic historiography arises. The rules used to ascertain these facts are basically two-fold; first, there is an analysis of the sources in question to determine earlier and later elements in the material, thereby enabling the historian to discriminate between more and less trustworthy portions; second, internal criticism is applied to determine how the author’s point of view might affect his statement of the facts, thereby enabling the historian to make allowances for the distortions thus produced.” See McDonald & Porter, *Early Christianity and its Sacred Literature*, 20, n.22.

9. McDonald & Porter, *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature*, 5.

10. Here what is intended is the emergence of something really new, unparalleled by any other event in history.

11. McDonald & Porter, *Early Christianity and its Sacred Literature*, 8.

12. W. H. Walsh, *An Introduction to Philosophy of History*, third, revised edition (London, 1967 [1951]) 182.

agree with an American historian on the causes, effects, and even particular battles of the American revolutionary war.”¹³ However, this subjective element in historiography should not be exaggerated. In fact, historiography is to be seen as a dialectical process between inevitable subjective standpoints and the professed ideal of recapturing the greatest possible objective knowledge.

The problems involved in historiography are even more acute in the area of historical-Jesus studies. Here the particular issues that aggravate the situation are the lack of sources that are directly reliable and the nature of the sources, which are ancient and fragmentary, and which are ‘faith’ documents formulated by early Christians, and which contain the worldview of their time. On the other side of the coin, the history of Christianity demonstrates Christianity’s strenuous effort down through the centuries to keep faith in the historical figure of Jesus as the Son of God incarnate. The well-known Christological controversies and the different local and ecumenical councils bear witness to this fact. The idea that a particular, historical, human person who lived in a particular place in a particular time is also God was something that was not entirely digestible for many early Christians. The councils of the Church, however, emphatically affirmed that the person of Jesus was both divine and human. These two areas - that of history and of faith - are apparently irreconcilable. This apparent

irreconcilability, however, is only one possibility. There might be other possibilities, too. Many contemporary theologians, like, C.F.D. Moule, N.T. Wright and Gerald O’ Collins, believe that it is possible to discover sufficient evidence from the available historical material to prove that the beginnings of Christian faith has solid foundations in the historical person of Jesus of Nazareth.

1.2 Different Modes of Relation between History and Faith

Due to the complexities involved in the relation between history and faith, it is useful to provide a survey of possible perspectives. In this attempt, I basically make use of short overview and framework offered by Avery Dulles, despite my hesitation to agree with all his suggestions.¹⁴ According to Dulles, there are four major approaches to the relation between history and faith. They are: 1) history against faith, 2) the separation of history and faith, 3) history as ground of faith and 4) the Gospels as interpreted history. The first approach was employed by nineteenth-century questers with their antidogmatic worldview. Dulles also includes Crossan in this category although Dulles notes that Crossan recognises the divinity of Jesus Christ.¹⁵ In his discussion of the second approach Dulles mainly focuses on John P. Meier. According to Dulles, “Christian believers... will wonder whether Meier the believer would disagree with Meier the historian” if he takes his faith out of brackets.¹⁶ This second approach, Dulles

13. McDonald & Porter, *Early Christianity and its Sacred Literature*, 8.

14. Avery Dulles, S.J., *The Craft of Theology: From Symbol to System*. System, new explained edition (New York, 1995 [1992])

15. Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 214.

16. Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 217

asserts, “by severing the links between faith and history, tends to deliver the earthly career of Jesus to the vicissitudes of historical research, and thereby imperils the integrity of catholic faith.”¹⁷ While affirming the limited value of this approach for historical research, Dulles rejects its usefulness for the Church and believers.

The third approach, namely, history as ground of faith, is the view that “historical investigation establishe[s] rational foundations for the commitment of Christian faith.” This approach is manifest in three main forms. The first form is a native apologetics represented by authors like Hilarin Felder and Louis Claude Fillion, who claim that the Gospels offer clear historical data, and that Jesus’ divine Sonship can be proved through historical research. A more modest version of this same form is suggested by scholars like Joachim Jeremias who, through sophisticated analysis of the Gospel texts, argue that, for instance, Jesus was aware of “having a relationship of singular intimacy with God as his Father.” The problem with this approach is that believers do not want to base their faith on such scholarly hypotheses, comments Dulles. The second form of the third approach is clearly seen in the new quest of the historical Jesus. According to Dulles, this second form is useful for believers as a starting point. The spokesman for the third form is Wolfhart Pannenberg who clearly bases faith in history. He claims that Christ-event happened in history and that therefore a comprehensive understanding of

history within which God’s actions are discernible would reveal Jesus’ divine Sonship. Dulles notes that “Pannenberg’s comprehensive concept of history is so broad that it deprives history of its character as a special discipline.” Further, even with this comprehensive approach the findings do not go beyond the borders of probability. However, Pannenberg’s approach is useful, Dulles says, because it transcends the limitations of the new quest.¹⁸

The fourth approach perceives the Gospel as interpreted history. It recognises the Gospels not simply as historical records, but as faith documents composed on the basis of historical facts. Their purpose was more to preach the good news, “God’s saving action in Jesus Christ” and they are “[r]ichly charges with theological interpretation.... The story of Jesus has been reworked in the light of the Church’s Easter faith and then further adapted to meet the needs of the particular communities for which our four Gospels were written....” Dulles recognises the value of historical investigation to reconstruct the historical details of the career of Jesus. Historical research into the Gospels, for believers, is not for correcting “the teaching of the New Testament or the established doctrines of the Church.” On the contrary, it is “to provide additional data and thereby give a better understanding of Christ and the Gospels.”¹⁹

Dulles recognises the serviceability of “neutral or hostile” methods (i.e., various critical methods) employed in historiography.

17. Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 218.

18. Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 218-219.

19. The quotes in this paragraph are from Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 220-221

“Certain kerygmatic and theological ingredients have to be filtered out” in order to recover the actual historical incidents in Jesus’ life. However, Dulles remarks that “antecedent presumptions” or “a prioris” deeply influence all such studies. He therefore notes that “believers who want to recover the full truth about will take advantage of the light that faith can supply.” To take artificial restrictions” for the purpose of attempting neutral historical research “would seriously prejudice the results.” “Even historians who share the same (Christian) faith disagree about many factual details” in Jesus’ life.

Dulles further discusses the usefulness of historical research “conducted in the light of faith.” In his view, this has four major gains. First, historians can supplement the knowledge yielded by “faith and Church teaching without reliance on scientific historiography.” So, for example, such research can yield greater probability about the actual words of Jesus as regards different variant readings in different sources, or about Jesus’ attitude towards social or political issues. “Second, by identifying certain elements in the Gospel as historically factual, the historian can on some points confirm the faith of the believers.” For instance, it can effectively support the believers’ position “that Jesus understood himself as bringing in the final age of salvation” or “that he understood himself as having a singular intimacy with his heavenly Father.” Third, critical study of the Gospels

enables us to distinguish more clearly between the respective competences of faith and history.” When critical history arrives at unsatisfactory conclusions concerning faith, believers are to recognise that faith and critical history operate in different realms. Fourth, the critical study of the gospels can correct certain misunderstandings among believers, such as the earlier judgement of the Church that Jesus had infused knowledge in such a way that he did not need to learn from any external sources. The second Vatican Council corrects this misconception (*Dei Verbum*, 12).²⁰

2. History and the New Testament : An Approach for Today

According to James D.G. Dunn, there are three elements to focus on in the study of the historical Jesus: faith, history, and hermeneutics. He contends that, first, faith influences the scholar of Jesus studies, at least Dunn himself, whether it is bracketed or not. Second, Jesus is a historical figure and faith in Jesus is a historical datum. third, “hermeneutics.... provides a kind of bridge between faith and history.”²¹ Thus, Dunn explains the dynamics of the relation between faith and history by including the third element, namely, hermeneutics. The word, “hermeneutics,” evokes complexity, especially in contemporary philosophical and theological reflection.²² According to Dunn, the relationship among faith, history and hermeneutics is such that it may be compared to “a somewhat uncomfortable *menage a trois*.”²³

20. In this paragraph and the previous one, I have closely followed Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 221 - 223.

21. James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, Christianity in the Making, vol. I (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK, 2003), 12-13.

22. The word “hermeneutics” originates from the Greek word *hermeneia*, which may be translated as ‘translation’ or interpretation’.

23. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 99.

2.1 Some Basic Issues in the Discussion Regarding historical Research and the Christian Faith

Dunn observes that historical research involves a number of elements to be taken seriously. The historical distance and difference, the principals of probability and analogy, the illusion of pure objectivity, and so forth are major importance. First, concerning the issue of historical distance and difference, the oftquoted phrase, "The past is a foreign country: they do things differently there." is instructive.²⁴ Dunn refers to Schweitzer who instructed scholars that Jesus is to be regarded as "a stranger and an enigma" to us.²⁵ To recognise the fact of historical distance and difference with regard to the biblical narrativs would enable the modern scholar to refrain from uncritically modernizing Jesus of Nazareth.

The second element to be considered according to Dunn, is the principle of probability. Historical knowledge acquired through modern critical methodology can claim only probability, and not certainty. However, Dunn underscores the fact that, in historical research, the word "probability" is extremely weighty.²⁶ Faith, for him, does no

imply any certainty in mathematical terms but is better expressed in terms of assurance and trust. According to Dunn.

It was the Enlightenment assumption that necessary truths of reason are like mathematical axioms, and that what is in view is the certain QED of mathematical proof, which has skewed the whole discussion. But faith moves in a totally different realm from mathematics. The language of faith uses words like 'confidence' and 'assurance' rather than 'certainty'. Faith deals in trust, not in mathematical calculations, nor in a science which methodically doubts everything which can be doubted. Nor is it to be defined simply as 'assent to propositions as true' (Newman). Walking 'by faith' is different from walking by sight' (2 Cor. 5.7). Faith is commitment, not just conviction.²⁷

Although Dunn here apparently misunderstands Newman²⁸ there is an analogy between "probability" in scientific language²⁹ and certainty in ordinary human life.³⁰ This implies that the expression, "probable," in

24. L.P. Hartely, *The Go-Between* (London, 1953), as quoted in Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 28.

25. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its progress from Reimarus to Wrede* [German original: *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu Forschung* (Tubingen, 1906)], trans F.C. Burkitt (London, 1998) 399.

26. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 103; Philip August Boeckh, "Philological Hermeneutics," in Kurt Mueller-Vollmer (ed.), *Hermeneutics Reader* (Oxford, 1986 [1985]) 132-147

27. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 104. QED means "quod erat demonstrandum" (the words mean: "that which must be proved")

28. Dunn himself in a footnote points out that he came to know from one of his colleagues that for Newman "certainty" and "certitude" are "ultimately personal, the sort of certitude that we have in our personal relations, in which we trust, love and have faith in God and one another," See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 105, n. 18.

29. Even the word science cannot be used as univocal. But here I use the term in relation to the human sciences.

30. Thiselton quotes A.D. Galloway: "Merely probable knowledge is psychologically compatible with the trustful certainty of faith.... There is nothing illogical or unreasonable in the combination of such trust with merely probable knowledge," See Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer and Wittgenstein* (Granville, Australia; Cape Town, South Africa, 1980) 83.

historical research should not be reduced to a level of sheer uncertainty.

The third element is analogy. The homogeneity between the historian and his or her subject matter enables the historian to approach the past with empathy and to "relive" it.³¹ Dunn states that this empathy was of central importance in the "emergence of 'historical consciousness' in Romanticism." Historical consciousness enables the historian to approach the past on its own terms. It also helps the historian, after dealing and community" by means of an empathetic approach. In this way, Dunn claims, even an unbelieving historian can enter into the faith experience of the first Christians. However, without an empathetic approach, the historian is unable "to relive" the past experience.³² In doing that, of course, the historian is to be rigorously self-critical of his/her faith.

In this regard, it is important to bear in mind that the principle of analogy is limited because, by nature, it is unable to admit anything genuinely new in history. Although the principle serves as an effective tool against unwarranted and fantastic historical reconstructions, it also, by the same token, rules out any possibility of historical knowledge about anything genuinely new that might happen in history. As such, this principle is too limited and calls for other complementary methods.³³ Thiselton refers to Boyce Gibson who suggests that, "on the basis of a Humean epistemology or a thoroughly empiricist

world-view, 'anything that happens for the first time is to be discribed'.³⁴

Fourth, the nineteenth-century concept of objectivity is now recognised to be an illusion. First of all, the idea of recapturing objective knowledge about the past emerged in the context of an Enlightenment sensibility based on the Newtonian world view that the universe is a closed system, and that the cause-effect relationships among particles and events in the universe could be completely unravelled. However, the contemporary "recognition of indeterminacy in explanation and of [existence of] complimentary and confliction explanations possible at both microcosmic and macrocosmic level has confirmed that Troeltsch's perception of reality was too restricted."³⁵

A corollary to this point is to be seen in Wright's argument against a particular, "popular 'modern view.'" According to that view it is the moderns who understand what scientific history is, while the ancients were "freely making things up, weaving fantasy and legend together and calling it history." Wright contends that this is nothing but a "modern myth, legitimating the cultural imperialism of the Enlightenment without having any basis in the real history of the ancient world." The ancient historians understood the nature of history "as well as we do, and often a lot better. Herodotus..... criticized some of the tales he recorded from other people on the grounds that they betrayed too much of the observers'

31. On this point Dunn bases himself on Wilhelm Dilthey. See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 105

32. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 106. Here Dunn bases himself on Gadamer and Dilthey. See *Truth and Method*, 232.

33. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 107

34. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons*, 79.

35. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 107.

(presumably eccentric) points of view.” Wright notes that Herodotus that in this case it “has resulted in distortion of actual events,” Wright wants to show that, like all the major historians of the ancient world, Herodotus knew the difference between history proper and mere historiography, the attempt to record ‘what happened’ from one day to the next. At the same time, he knew as well as we do that there are such things as actual events, and that it is the business of the historian to write about them, discounting ones which he thinks incredible.”³⁶

The foregoing paragraphs show that an unqualified objectivity can no longer be claimed for historical knowledge, in the fashion of nineteenth-century historiography. Moreover, it has become clear that the perspectives shaping nineteenth-century historical method were far too limited. That means that it is important to find ways that complement and/or correct old presuppositions and methodologies in our effort to understand the past.

2.2 Methodological Issues in Contemporary Hermeneutical Discussion

According to many recent theories of reading, especially among advocates of Literary Criticism, there is hardly any normative meaning to be found in a text. Such theories are grounded on certain understandings about the nature of the text, such as, the autonomy of the text. Depriving the text of any roots and absolutizing concepts like the autonomy of the text may be justified within a theoretical system but it discards any norm for

understanding except the subjective decisions of the reader.

2.2.1 The Essential Communicability of Meaning

One of the major criticisms against such modern theories is that a historical text is to be considered as a historical text. In other words, every attempt to understand a text is translation or interpretation. And every translation or interpretation inevitably should have some normative reference against which the translation may be tested for its correctness. Dunn offers the example of the translation of the New Testament from Greek to other European languages. For those who did not have the knowledge of Greek, the New Testament writings were nothing more than ink spots on the page. Latin being the “*lingua franca*” of ancient and mediaeval Europe, it was necessary for them, first, to identify the Greek letters in the New Testament texts “as Greek, and as ancient Greek.” Secondly, they had to translate them into other languages. In carrying out this activity, they had to refer back to the basic text as a norm for the validity of their translation. It is important to note that ‘any’ translation of a particular text is not, and cannot be accepted as, a valid or correct translation. This implies, Dunn affirms, that there can be “bad [=poor], or even dare one say it?) *wrong* translations.” According to Dunn, “it is simply important to recognize the *character of historical texts as historical texts*. For the Greek text read as a historical text (interpretations as well as translations taking account of accidents, syntax and idiom of the day) inevitably functions as a norm for legitimacy of modern

36 N.T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 1 (London, 1992) 84.

readings too.” If the normativity of that basic text is denied, then “the very identity of the text is at stake.” This position in no way denies the possibility of different translations of a particular text because it is impossible to make the “exact” translation of a text into another language. There can be different valid translations. The point I want to make is that a norm for all those valid translations should not be denied.³⁷

The second element that Dunn highlights is the priority of the plain or literal meaning. As Dunn notes, although many recent theories, especially among practitioners of Literary Criticism, raise fundamental questions about “the meaning of ‘meaning’ itself” or about “the idea of stability of meaning or of specific meaning being effectively communicated from (or through) text to reader,”

The very concept of effective communication, on the basis of which the overwhelming majority of lectures and speeches are delivered, books and letters written, depends on the assumption that words and sentences constructed with a view to communicate an intention can usually hope for a large measure of success in so communicating. Despite theorists denying the referentiality of texts outside of themselves, nowhere have practising historians given up the

belief that language refers to reality; texts are still viewed as vehicles for communications of consciously held ideas.³⁸

This emphasis on the communicability of meaning does not rule out the possibility of bad or false communication. Such communications are possible. It seems that Dunn only wants to argue against the position that there is no norm whatsoever for interpreting a text. Again, in Dunn’s words, “historical criticism does not dictate the limits beyond which readings of the text become implausible and illegitimate.”³⁹ The emphasis on the “plain meaning” or literal sense implies that it is possible to enter into the “authorial intention as contextualized,” albeit not into the actual “creative experience of authorial composition” against which the criticism of intentional fallacy was employed.⁴⁰ Attention here is given to the “contextualized” intention of the author “as a communicative act between author and intended readers/auditors.”⁴¹

2.2.2 The importance of Tradition in Biblical Interpretation

In Gadamer’s thought, the proper interpretation of a text takes place within its tradition. The concept of tradition in Gadamer is based on his concept of “effective-historical

37 This paragraph is based on, and all the quotes therein are from, Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 112-113.

38 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 116.

39 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 117. If some norm for recapturing the meaning of any text is denied in theory, Dunn argues that, “[o]n this logic, we should abandon all laws of copyright and ‘intellectual property’ and strike the term (and the academic ‘sin’ of) ‘plagiarism’ from our vocabulary and university rule books.”

40 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 118.

41 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 118. Dunn adds: “Paul’s letters (the most obvious examples in the NT of intentional texts) were not always effective communication, in that the response they elicited was not as he would have wished. But the fact that so many of them (some were lost) were respected, retained, no doubt read and reread, pondered, circulated, collected, and finally gathered to become part of the NT canon attests their overall effectiveness.” See *ibid.*, n.66.

consciousness.” This is integrally related to the understanding of “language and linguisticality, which fuse into each other,” in Gadamer’s perspective. Mueller-Vollmer observes that “language” in Gadamer acts in a fashion similar to “Heidegger’s Being (*das Sein*) which hides itself in the very closeness of things that are (*das Seiende*).”⁴² According to Mueller-Vollmer, language, for Gadamer, is the overarching element that envelops the interpreter and his object. “Understanding and interpretation for Gadamer constitute the mode of being of all our cultural traditions. These traditions are necessarily embedded in language (*die Sprache*).” In Gadamer’s analysis, it is “explication” (i.e., “interpretive discourse”) of the text that “brings understanding to the fore.” Explication, according to Gadamer, “has become part of that which is understood.”⁴² According to Mueller-Vollmer, since interpretation, in Gadamer’s view, “is always explication expressed through language... linguistic explication must be considered ‘the very essence of explication’.”⁴³

Mueller-Vollmer’s analysis contains a critique of Gadamer’s position, namely, that it appears to make understanding identical with interpretation. Consequently, “Gadamer’s position - if developed to its extreme - would allow the meaning of a work or a text ultimately to appear only as embedded in its different explications, its specific receptions.” If this critique is recognized, Mueller-Vollmer maintains, “there would no longer be textual

meanings to be understood, only explications to be explicated.”⁴⁴ According to him, there is therefore an “ambiguity” in Gadamer’s position because, together with the aforementioned claim, Gadamer also holds the normativity of the text. It appears that Gadamer envisages a thread of relationship between contemporary explications and the very first explication in the history of the text. If that thread is to be seen as of the order of a connecting link between the past and the present, every interpretation, although it was created at a particular time, is necessarily related to the original text itself.

2.2.3 The Importance of Drawing a Broad Picture

In addition, Wright suggests that it is necessary to view things in a broad way rather than looking at each small detail of a particular New Testament text. He also appeals to Meyer’s emphasis on the theory that understanding the ‘part’ is necessary in the process of understanding the ‘whole’, and vice versa.⁴⁵ In other words, to concentrate first and foremost on the veracity of the minute details and then to attempt to reconstruct the historical portrait by joining the proven minute details will never enable the historian to reach a meaningful reconstruction of a historical portrait. Thus, for example, Wright speaks about the formation of a “good *historical* hypothesis” and its verification as the two important aspects of the historical method

42. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik* (Tübingen, 1972) 376, as translated and quoted in Mueller - Vollmer, “Introduction,” 40.

43. Mueller-Vollmer, “Introduction,” 40-41.

44. Mueller-Vollmer, “Introduction,” 41.

45. Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London, 1979) 21.

(of course, as in every historical method).⁴⁶ For Wright, the formation of a “good *historical* hypothesis” is different from what many conceive it to be. There are three elements, according to Wright, in the formation of a good historical hypothesis: (1) “It must include the data.” By this he means that every bit and piece of evidence is to be included in the data pool and nothing should be left out of it.⁴⁷ (2) “It must construct a basically simple and coherent overall picture.” That is to say, when all the possible data are put together, the hypothesis formed should be a simple and coherent one. Here he notes the problem that “getting in the data, and simplicity... are always... in tension with each other.” In other words, it is easier and is always a temptation for the researcher either to form a simple hypothesis disregarding some of the data or to include

all the data and form a highly complicated hypothesis. Wright provides an example, namely, the hypothesis of “Jesus the simple Galilean peasant.” This is “simple” and “straightforward” but it excludes a good deal of the data.⁴⁸ (3) The hypothesis should attempt to establish a relationship between the specified area research and its wider background. For instance, the relation between Jesus and Paul, in the context of the first century as a whole, could be considered.

In the process of the formation of a good historical hypothesis and of verification, it is of extreme importance, according to Wright, to take seriously the “worldviews” of the people or time which is the subject of historical investigation. “Worldviews have to do with the presuppositional, pre-cognitive stage of a

46 The common element in the historical method is that every historical method “proceeds by means of ‘hypotheses’, which stand in need of ‘verification’”. Wright puts this differently by saying “that human life is lived by implicit and explicit stories; that these stories throw up questions; that humans then advance explanatory stories to deal with these questions; that some of these stories attain a degree of success.” Within the formulation of any hypothesis and in its verification, these elements are present. Thus there are similarities in procedure. What Wright wants to say is that just as “‘hypothesis’ and ‘verification’” are an essential part of historical method, so too are they at work in ordinary human life. He employs these terms with the aforementioned ‘ordinary overtones’ of those terms. See Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 98.

47 Wright, while explaining his historical method, states that “[a] hypothesis... is essentially a construct, thought up by a human mind, which offers itself as a story about a particular set of phenomena, in which the story, which is bound to be an interpretation of those phenomena, also offers an *explanation* of them.” For illustrating the procedure of the formulation of a hypothesis, he gives the example of a catastrophe: “I see a police car tearing down the wrong side of the road with its sirens blaring... I guess that a crime has been committed, or perhaps that there has been an accident... I subsequently hear a fire-engine in a neighboring street, and see a cloud of smoke arising close by. At once I change my hypothesis: the appearance of new data has helped me clarify matters. Of course, it could still be the case that the police car is chasing a thief, and knows nothing of the fire; but the probability remains high, because of the inherent simplicity of the hypothesis and its inclusion of the data, that the events belong together.... I then remembered that I heard an unexplained explosion ten minutes before. Again, this could be unrelated, but a picture is coming together with an essential simplicity and is starting to reach out and explain more data that I had not originally connected with the event...” See Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 99. In forming a good hypothesis, according to Wright, we should not “pretend that the smoke was a low cloud” or something else. See *ibid.*, 100.

48 Referring to his own example, about the formation of a simple hypothesis, Wright says: “It *could* be that neither the explosion, the smoke, the fire-engine nor the police car had anything to do with each other, but until we collect more data, such as observing the police car going away from the fire and towards a bank which is being robbed, it is simpler to suggest that they are parts of the same reasonably straightforward whole.” See Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 100.

culture or society.”⁴⁹ Within the “ultimate concerns”⁵⁰ of humans, worldviews also are present. Wright notes that worldviews do four things: (1) They “provide the *stories* through which human beings view reality.” That is, worldviews are expressed through narratives. (2) These stories offer answers to “the basic questions that determine human existence: who are we, what are we, what is wrong and what is the solution?” That is, “the questions of identity, environment, evil and eschatology.” (3) The “stories that express the worldview, and the answers” to the aforementioned questions “are expressed... in cultural *symbols*. These can be both artifacts and events - festivals, family gatherings, and the like.” (4) “Worldviews include a praxis, a way-of-being-in-the-world.” That is, the worldview of a person is expressed in her or his “*action*.”⁵¹ The “fundamental Christian worldview, expressed... through story, answers to questions, symbols and praxis” causes the emergence of “a system of *basic beliefs*” (“credal formula”) which belongs to a more conscious level compared to “the worldview itself.” The Christian credal formula originated from a Christian worldview. The basic beliefs in turn give birth to “certain *consequent beliefs*.”⁵²

Thus, according to Wright, a proper historical study of the life and works of Jesus

and of the origins of Christianity entails a serious consideration of the Christian worldview and the theological perspectives reflected in the New Testament writings.

2.2.4 The Gospels Reflect the Remembered Jesus

Having surveyed the major points in the contemporary hermeneutical and epistemological discussion, we can now turn to several other elements that are relevant to our attempt to affirm the basic historicity of the Gospel narratives. Meyer, Wright and Dunn suggest that the Jesus materials reflect the memory of Jesus’ disciples. Meyer regards these so-called materials as basically faith responses. A perfect stripping away of the elements of this disciple - response from, for instance, the Gospels will amount to the reduction of their historicity to zero.⁵³

According to Dunn, what has come down to us from Jesus of Nazareth is the disciples’ faith-response to Jesus. On this point, he partly subscribes to Kähler.⁵⁴ In Dunn’s own words, “The hearing and witnessing of the first disciples was already a hermeneutical act already caught in the hermeneutical circle.” Contemporary exegetes only “continue a dialogue which began in the initial formation

49 Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 122. See also Heikki Räisänen, *Beyond New Testament Theology: A Story and a Program* (London, Philadelphia, 1990) 129-130, 199.

50 The term “ultimate concern” is introduced by Paul Tillich in order to denote “the religious dimension” in “all ordinary experience” of secular life. See David H. Kelsey, “Paul Tillich”, in David F. Ford (ed.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century* (Malden, Oxford, 1998 [1997] 87-102, 98.

51 Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 122-124.

52 Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 134.

53 Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus*, 72-73.

54 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 126-127.

of the tradition;" they did not begin it. In other words, the Gospel accounts "attest the *impact* made by Jesus" on the disciples. Therefore, according to Dunn, it is futile to try

to get behind that impact to a Jesus who might have been heard otherwise. For the original impulse behind these records was... sayings of Jesus as heard and received, and actions of Jesus as witnessed and retained in the memory (both parts of each phrase being important). We have to add in both cases, and as reflected on thereafter, of course. However, what we have in these traditions is not just the end-product of that reflection. It is rather the faith-creating word/event as itself a force shaping faith and as retained and rehearsed by the faith thus created and being created. In other words, the Jesus tradition gives immediate access not to a dispassionately recorded word or deed, nor only to the end product (the faith of the 50s, 60s, 70s, or 80s), but also to the process between the two, to the tradition which began with the initial impact of Jesus' word or deed and which continued to influence immediate retellers of the tradition until crystallized in Mark's or Matthew's or Luke's account. In short we must take seriously, the character of the tradition as disciple - response, and the depth of the tradition as well as its final form.⁵⁵

Subscribing to Kähler, Dunn thus argues that the Gospels (particularly the Synoptics) witness not to "what Jesus did or said in itself, but... [to] what Jesus was *remembered* as doing or saying by his first disciples." In other words, the Gospels witness to "the *impact* of what he did and said on his first disciples." In this sense, 'remembering' is the element that "fuses the horizons of past and present by making the past present again (*Vergegenwärtigung*).⁵⁶

The emphasis given to the idea of "remembering" in no way devalues the effort to find the actual Jesus behind these memories. A portrayal of such a remembered Jesus "is neither illegitimate nor... impossible."⁵⁷ Dunn observes that the faith of the disciples in Jesus cannot be said to have started after the resurrection. Their faith was also formed on the basis of their interaction with Jesus before his death, which they remembered after the resurrection more vividly and in a new light. Dunn claims that the age-old tension between history and faith could be resolved once we recognize the significance of the disciples' memory in the Jesus tradition.⁵⁸

The primary means of propagating the tradition in the beginning of the Christian communities was teaching. In the process of teaching, Dunn observes, there were two important motifs, namely, "bearing witness" and "remembering." In Acts and John the motif of bearing witness is clearly seen.⁵⁹ In the Johannine epistles the motif of bearing

55 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 129-130.

56 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 130. According to Meyer, the "overarching fact is that Palestinian Christianity was nourished on the memory of Jesus." See Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus*, 69.

57 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 131.

58 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 132.

59 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 177-178. Cf. Acts 1:8; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:41; 13:31; Jn 1:7-8, 15, 19, 32, 34; 3:26, 28; 4:39; 5:32; 12:17; 15:26-27; 19:35; 21:24.

witness is “strengthened by two complementary motifs,” namely, “the ‘from the beginning’ (ap’archēs) theme,” and “a continuity of ‘hearing’” theme. In Jn 15:26-27 and in Lk 1:1-2 the phrase, “from the beginning,” refers to “the whole of the original disciples’ time with Jesus (as with Acts 1:22).”⁶⁰ Similarly, the motif of remembering is found in several places in Paul when he exhorts his audience to keep the traditions like the remembrance of Jesus by the disciples in the eucharistic celebration (1 Cor 11:24-25; Lk 22:19).⁶¹

An emphasis like that accorded to the motif of “bearing witness” and “remembering” leads us immediately into the sphere of the heated discussion as to how far these remembered elements could be identified and recaptured from the New Testament, especially the Gospels. In other words, what is the result of the aforementioned position about the presence of biographical elements in the Gospels? Basing himself on Aune, Dunn affirms that “since the 1970s... it has become much clearer

that the Gospels are in fact very similar in type to *ancient biographies*.”⁶² According to Burridge, “*biography is a type of writing which occurs naturally among groups of people who have formed around a certain charismatic teacher or leader seeking to follow after him*” [italics original]. “The educated man of the Hellenistic world was curious about the lives of famous people.”⁶³ Ancient biographies were not simply just “dispassionate and objective” descriptions of a person, but attempts to show the character of a person through his or her words and deeds, as well as serving as propaganda for the person.⁶⁴ “In other words, the overlap between Gospel and ancient biography remains substantial and significant.”⁶⁵

Further, Dunn addresses the contention that highlights the vastly diverse possibilities of reading a single text according to the newer theories of hermeneutis and its application to the Gospels. He recognizes that possibility. In the Gospels, for instance, there are even hints of Jesus’ movements which had no knowledge of Jesus’ death and resurrection (Mk 9:38-41; Acts 19: 1-7). Despite such differences, Dunn

60 Here in Luke there is the reference to “eyewitnesses” to Jesus. See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 178.

61 Dunn notes a list of these phrases seen in the different New Testament books and in the Fathers of the Church. See Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 178-179.

62 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 185. See also, for instance, David Edward Aune, *New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia, 1987) chs 1, 2; R.A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Cambridge, 1992).

63 The two quotes are from Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 80-81, 150-151 respectively.

64 Greco-Roman biography “may be defined as a discrete prose narrative devoted exclusively to the portrayal of the whole life of a particular individual perceived as historical.” Aune, *New Testament in its Literary Environment*, 29. There were two types of biography in the Greco-Roman world. One, the Plutarchian, was a “chronologically ordered narrative with literary ambitions, appropriate for depicting statesmen, generals and philosophers.” The second type, “originated with Alexandrian grammarians, ... had no artistic pretensions and contained a systematically arranged account of an individual and his accomplishments.” See *ibid.*, 31. For Aune’s references regarding comparison between Greco-Roman biographies and the Gospels, see *ibid.*, 28 & 63, 30, 57, 36 & 62, 57-58.

65 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 185.

notes, there is homogeneity in the synoptic tradition.⁶⁶

The historical Jesus was significant for the first flowering of Christian faith. This is the relevance of the historical Jesus for faith. Dunn summarises his arguments as follows:

(1) The only realistic objective for any 'quest of the historical Jesus' is Jesus remembered. (2) The Jesus tradition of the Gospels confirms that there was a concern within earliest Christianity to remember Jesus. (3) The Jesus tradition shows us *how* Jesus was remembered; its character strongly suggests again and again a tradition given its essential shape by regular use and reuse in oral mode. (4) This suggests in turn that that essential shape was given by the original and immediate impact made by Jesus as that was first put into words by and among those involved or eyewitnesses of what Jesus said and did. In that key sense, the Jesus tradition *is* Jesus remembered. And the Jesus thus remembered *is* Jesus, or as close as we will ever be able to reach back to him.⁶⁷

In short, the claim that the Gospels contain sufficient data on the life of Jesus can be described as highly probable.

Conclusion

The proper scholarly approach to the Bible, therefore, cannot be one like that of nineteenth-century criticism. On the contrary, it is now recognised as one which incorporates different approaches and methodologies as complementary. Werner Kelber advocates such an approach.⁶⁸ Commenting on *Dei Verbum* 12, Gerald O'Collins underscores "the need to attend to a) the original authors [of the biblical texts], b) their texts and c) their hearers, readers and interpreters."⁶⁹ In his own words, Critical theories of interpretation should, in one way or another, take into account a) the authors of texts, b) the texts themselves and c) the readers of these texts. Some theories focus on the relationship between a) text and b) reader even to the point of discounting completely the role of the original authors and their intentions. Or else meaning becomes virtually identified with a) text itself, leaving both authorial intention b) and active reader response c) disregarded as irrelevant. *Dei*

66 He discusses the Gospel of John and says that the tradition in John is different from the Synoptics. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 165-167.

67 Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 335.

68 Werner Kelber writes: "Our task now is to move beyond formalism in literary theory and practice, although not in the sense of retreating to the older historical, philological model of interpretation... Once we learn to see distinctions between a chirographically and a typographically informed hermeneutic, and grasp a sense of the hermenetics of revisionism and vivification typical of ancient, biblical manuscripts, might we not grow more tolerant methodologically, acknowledging gospels both as integral narratives and as narrative participants in tradition, as documents both of synchronic integrity and diachronic depth? Or, to put it more provocatively, are not the gospels both 'windows' and 'mirrors' giving us worlds that interact with other worlds? In any case, fear of the 'referential fallacy' should not cause us to disclaim the manifold ties the gospels have with tradition, for no text is composed in complete referential neutrality, not in antiquity, least of all in the biblical tradition." See Werner Kelber, "Narrative as Interpretation and Interpretation of Narrative: Hermeneutical Reflections on the Gospels," *Semeia* 39 (1987) 107-133, 124.

69 Gerald O'Collins, *Retrieving Fundamental Theology: The Three Styles of Contemporary Theology* (London, 1993) 147.

Verbum, however, rightly attends to reminding us in particular of the creativity and community of interpretation constituted by the “living tradition” as it reads and responds to the “open” Bible. The intention of the original authors and the guidance of the magisterium function to set some limits to the reader response today. To this schema of biblical interpretation we need to add the role of the very text itself, which in its inspired otherness can become for us the living and guiding word of God.⁷⁰

In the light of the foregoing discussion, a

proper approach towards interpreting the New Testament seems to be one that would take different factors in an integral whole. In order to do that, *inter alia*, the recognition of the role of tradition in the interpretation of the text, of the fact that the Bible contains historical data and of the story-character of the Bible are crucial. The resultant vision of the New Testament would involve the notions of “window” and “mirror”. Avery Dulles’ suggestion of perceiving faith as interpreted history contains a great deal of this holistic approach.

■

70 O’Collins, *Retrieving Fundamental Theology*, 149.

BOOK REVIEW

Francis Kanichikattil: *Divine Liturgy in the Vision Of Narsai*. Bangalore, Dharmaram Publications, 2003, xvi+126p. ISBN 86-86861-49-1

The author presents a short but detailed commentary on Narsai, the famous commentator of the Chaldean liturgy. He exposes the person and the theological work of Narsai who lived in the 5th Century, especially his work at the School of Edessa, one of the most ancient theological schools of Christianity, of which he was the director. This school was transferred in his lifetime. It was the period of the Christological disputes. In particular, the author scrutinizes the Christology of Narsai.

In the second part, he analyses his liturgical work. Indeed, Narsai is known to us, primarily by his homilies on the Eucharist and baptism in the Church of the East, of which we have an excellent English translation by R.H.Connolly: *Narsai: the liturgical homilies, Text and Studies*, Cambridge, University, 1909, reprint 1967.

Nevertheless, one can notice some serious lacunae in the study of Fr. Kanichikattil. This ought not to come as a surprise, since the author himself warns us that he has limited to publishing his thesis in theology, which he presented in 1985. Unfortunately, the modifications and corrections, which he claims to have added, are hardly visible: all throughout book one finds spelling and grammar mistakes. There are many mistakes in the bibliography and in the French language texts. What is worse is that the author seems to be unaware of the developments of the historical questions in the past years. According to Dr. S. Brock and other experts, Homily 17 is certainly from a disciple of Narsai, rather than from Narsai himself. Also, he repeats the opinion, abandoned for many years, that the Institution Words were omitted in the time of Patriarch Iso Yahb III, in the 7th Century (pp.55, 66-72); or that the Anaphora of Mar Nestorius is a translation of a Greek anaphora (pp.56, 107), an opinion refuted by the studies of P. Youssif, "The Anaphora of Mar Theodor East Syrian: further Evidences", in E. Carr (ed.), *Eulogema. Studies in honor of Robert Taft, s.j.* (Studia Anselmiana, 110, *Analecta Liturgica*, 17), Rome, 1993, 571-591; of A. Gelston, "The Origin of the Anaphora of Nestorius: Greek or Syriac?", in *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 7:3 (1996) 73-86, and of myself, R. Matheus, *The Third Order of Sanctification*, Kottayam, OIRSI, 2000.

Also, I wonder what the author means by "inculturation of the Bible"? (p. 108). It is also surprising to read that Cyril of Jerusalem belonged to the "antiochean trio" (P. 103).

Finally, the author makes an apology of the "Indian anaphoras" of the 1970s, which were inspired by Hindu texts, forgetting that India is a country of many cultures, and that one of them is the Christian culture. On this subject, a well known Anglican liturgist, B. Spinks, has written an excellent article: *The Anaphora for India. Some theological Objections to an Attempt at Inculturation*, in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 95 (1981) 529-549. One of the weakness of the Church in India, is that she always wants to copy, either from the West, or from the other religions of India, forgetting her own richness.

The great merit of the author is certainly to have furnished us an analysis of the liturgical commentary of Narsai. The study, which he presents, is, in spite of some weaknesses, enriching. We can thus advise it, in spite of the reservations which we have had to make.

Fr. Robert Matheus

“A PERIOD OF JURISDICTIONAL CONFLICT IN THE SURIANI CHURCH OF INDIA, 1800 - 1838”

By

JAMES ABRAHAM PULIURUMPIL

(Pub. No. 166, ORISI, Vadavathoor, 1994, Folio pp 320, Paper Back, Price Rs. 130)

(CATEGORY - ‘CHURCH HISTORY’)

The Padroadists, the Propagandists and the Protestants came; they saw; but they could not conquer the ‘Syrian Catholics’ of Malabar. This epitomizes the deductions of ‘James Abraham Puliurumpil’, in his doctoral dissertation captioned, “A Period of Jurisdictional Conflict In The Suriani Church Of India, 1800 - 1838”.

An assiduous analysis, an incisive investigation and an enlightening evaluation of the rise and fall of the Portuguese Jesuits, the Italian Carmelites and the Anglican Evangelists, in their rivalrous race to rule over the ‘Malabar Syrian Catholics’, during the early decades of the 19th C., and the indefatigable spirit of the ‘Syrians’, in preserving their time - honoured traditions and age-old identity, are the prime points of Puliurumpil’s research work referred above.

The author expatiates. Although, the foreigners could not subdue, much less obliterate the Syrian ethos, they made some headway in this period. The researcher rallies the reasons for their initial success. They were victorious because of the hierarchical, political and structural sanctions behind them. The ‘Suriani Church’ of India, in her overzealousness to have a ‘native’ bishop, fell under the spell of schism. The foreigners, ‘a fortio nri’ targeted it at the ‘Syrian Catholics’.

At the same time the penetrating ‘Puliurumpil’ has identified many a reason for the final failure of the ‘foreigners’. Numerical insufficiency of the Missionaries, the discord of the ‘discalced’ and the ‘calced’ Carmelites, the bad performance in the proselytism, the internecine feuds of the “insufficient ‘Padroado’ and ‘inefficient’ ‘Propaganda’ jurisdictions” are examples. To crown all these, the dissertator indubiously states that the foreigners ended in fiasco, as they “failed to understand the land and the situation of the people” of Malabar. In substantiation, the author cites the following from an authority of ‘Church History’, ‘Joseph Peruthottam’, presently the Auxiliary Bishop of Changanacherry. “The Missionaries considered the Church of St. Thomas Christians like a missionary field and approached it as any other mission”.

This work is the doctoral dissertation of James Abraham Puliurumpil, presently a professor of ‘Church History’ in the Faculty of ‘St. Thomas Apostolic Seminary’, Vadavathoor, Kottayam, Kerala. The ‘OIRSI’, vadavathoor, has published this thesis as their 166th issue. It bears the imprimatur of Mar Joseph Pallikaparampil, the then Bishop of Pala, Kerala. The

Book is naturally scholarly and makes no easy reading. The style of the author is simple and straight; the presentation is pleasing, especially because of the many anecdotes and episodes. Foot - notes in English and Latin are provided as occasions warrant. Lists of abbreviations and bibliography are provided on the opening pages. There are eight appendices, of which the first three are maps. They are not mere embellishments but illustrations to help study. The rest are statistical tables and extracts of documents. Indices of persons, places, periods etc. are alphabetically arranged. But the readers would wish that the English versions of the frequent and lengthy quotations from Latin sources were rendered into English and incorporated alongside. Also the types used in the foot-notes could have been of bigger cast, lest the readers skip them. On the whole, however, the get up is attractive, with the glazed coloured covers and nice printing.

The structure of the book is befitting that of a scholarly thesis. The author has profusely drawn from many MSS, materials from the Vatican, Propaganda Fide Archives, Carmelite Archives, British Parliament Library etc. They give authority and authenticity to the author's inferences and surmises. The work is divided into six chapters.

The dissertation concludes with the mind - boggling and thought - provoking epigram, "the Suriani Catholic Church, in being the battle - ground of this combat, lost nothing but the hope of self-role, and received nothing but the courage to stand up again for her cause". In spite of the initial feeling of pathos, one subsequently senses the pulsation of hope in this utterance of the researcher. Verily, the historian in the scholarly student Puliurumpil has here blossomed forth. To be sure, a historian, although cannot be a seer of the certain still can be a prophet of the probable. Transcending the pathetic and pitable tales of 'the dead yesterday', the researcher furnishes the optimistic note for 'the unborn tomorrow'. Though the researcher closed his search with '1838', the succeeding epochs in the saga of the Suriani Church of India, indubiously proved that the 'elan vital' or the 'vital energy' of this community did not get cowed down, much less erased. Thanks to the studies, the author had hinted at this as the dynamics of the futuristic course of the 'Suriani Catholic Church'. Truly it did full and fructify in the fullness of time, to the satisfaction of the author and all the 'Suriani' faithful.

O.M. Mathew Oruvattithara

NEWS

SYRO MALABAR BISHOPS, SYNOD, JANUARY 9-21, 2006

The Syro Malabar Bishops Synod gathered on 9-21 January at St. Thomas Mount Kakkanad, Kochi. The synod decided to carry out 'Syro Malabar Global Meet', which would be held from Aug. 18 to 20, 2006. The synod discussed the increasing attacks on life and property particularly of minority community, prevalence of widespread corruption, religious fascism and the ill effects of consuming liquor and drugs. The Synod has appointed a committee, 'Synodal Committee for Public Affairs' to study these negative effects and to decide on what action should be taken.

MAR MATHEW MOOLAKKATT THE NEW ARCHBISHOP OF KOTTAYAM

Mar Mathew Moolakkatt took the charge of the new archbishop of Kottayam on Saturday, 14 January 2005 as the successor of Mar Kuriakose Kunnacherry, the first Metropolitan of Kottayam. His Beatitude Varkey Cardinal Vithayathil enthroned the new Metropolitan Archbishop of Kottayam in the presence of almost all the bishops of the Syro-Malabar Church and a large number of other dignitaries, priests, religious and lay people.

Msgr. ANTONY CHIRAYATH NEW BISHOP OF SAGAR

The Holy Father appointed Msgr. Antony Chirayath on 2 February 2006, as bishop of the eparchy of Sagar of the Syro-Malabars. He was working as the bureau chief at the Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant Peoples in Rome. The bishop-elect was born in Aranattukara, India in 1941 and ordained a priest in 1970. He succeeds Bishop Joseph Pastor Neelankavil, C.M.I., Msgr. Chirayath will be ordained bishop by the Major Archbishop Mar Varkey Cardinal Vithayathil on 25 March 2006 at the Cathedral Church of the diocese of Sagar.

CARDINAL TOPPO RE-ELECTED PRESIDENT OF CBCI

The Indian Catholic Bishops assembled at St. Peter's Pontifical Seminary, Bangalore for the 27th General Body Meeting of Catholic Bishops' Conference of India (CBCI) from February 8 to 15. The theme of the meeting was 'Catholic Education and Church's concern for the marginalized'. The general body re-elected Cardinal Toppo as the President of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India. The 66 years old first tribal Cardinal has been the President of the Conference since 2004. Bishop Gracian Mundadan (Bijnor Diocese) has been elected First Vice President of the Conference. Bishop Isaac Mar Cleemis Thottunkal (Tiruvalla diocese) has been elected Second Vice President of CBCI. Archbishop Stanislaus Fernandes (Gandhinagar Archdiocese) has been elected Secretary General of CBCI.

DEUS CARITAS EST

Pope Benedict XVI published His first encyclical on 25 January 2006. The name of the encyclical is 'Deus Caritas Est' (God is love). In a 71-page booklet, the Pope presents that love has a single source and "different dimensions", that even in man can go beyond the moment of egoism, the research for one's own good, to transform itself, from eros into agape, in which "one no longer looks for oneself, but for the good of the other". Besides, Pope says that "since God loved us first," love is "the answer to the gift of love".

**IMMENSE SCOPE OF RESEARCH AWAITS YOU
IN THE GOLDEN TREASURES OF EASTERN THEOLOGIES
AND WE PROVIDE YOU WITH VALUABLE MATERIALS
WHICH WILL CERTAINLY INSPIRE YOUR SCHOLARLY PURSUITS
THROUGH**

CHRISTIAN ORIENT

A JOURNAL OF EASTERN CHURCHES FOR CREATIVE THEOLOGICAL THINKING

**AN INTERNATIONALLY ACCLAIMED QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF
ORIENTAL THEOLOGY PUBLISHED SUCCESSFULLY FOR THE LAST
TWENTY SIX YEARS OPENS BEFORE YOU THE COLOURFUL SPECTACLE
OF PRECIOUS GEMS IN THE THEOLOGICAL ARENAS OF
EASTERN LITURGY, SPIRITUALITY, ECCLESIOLOGY
AND ECUMENISM WITH A SPECIAL ACCENT ON
THE SYRIAC ORIENT AND THE ST THOMAS
CHRISTIAN TRADITION.**

THIS QUARTERLY HIGHLIGHTS

- ❖ Scientific studies on ecumenical ventures
- ❖ Different dimensions of the oriental ethos
- ❖ Current developments in the liturgical theology
- ❖ Perspectives of eastern ecclesiological traditions
- ❖ Investigations into the various aspects of the Canon Law
- ❖ Insights into the inspiring lives of the Fathers, the Saints and the Martyrs of the East

EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS

Abp Joseph Powathil, Abp George Valiamattom, Bp Sebastian Valloppilly, Bp George Punnakottil,
Bp A.D. Mattom, Bp Joseph Pallickaparampil, Bp Paul Chittilappilly, Bp George Alencherry,
Bp Sebastian Vadakel, Bp Joseph Kallarangatt, John Madey (Paderborn), Geevarghese Panickar,
Mathew Vellanickal, Xavier Koodapuzha

All Correspondence to

The Managing Editor
Christian Orient, P.B. No.1
Kottayam 686 010, Kerala
Ph. 0481-571809, 571807
E-mail: tmannoor@sancharnet.in
Web page Address: www.oirsi.com